



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

version from which F. was derived was older than the High German versions ; their ampler contents presuppose a second Low German version, doubtless derived from a common original with the first, which may be placed about the beginning of the century. Brie's treatment of these matters is admirably clear. Considering, too, how many ferocious epithets have been bandied to and fro by the commentators on Shakspeare and on Dante, it may not be impertinent to attest the uniform courtesy which this commentator on the far from mealy-mouthed German rogue observes towards his predecessors.

C. H. HERFORD.

OWENS COLLEGE,  
MANCHESTER, ENGLAND.

---

*The Genitive Case in Anglo-Saxon Poetry.* George Shipley.  
Johns Hopkins dissertation. Baltimore, 1903. Pp. 127.

Listing, as it does, all occurrences of the Genitive in the poetry of the Grein-Wülcker *Bibliothek*, Shipley's work both in importance of subject and in scope of research at once commands our attention. Whatever its shortcomings, such a study must be a significant one : even if it failed of discovery or proof, the very attempt would by excluding barren territory serve to concentrate the efforts of other workers upon the more fruitful soil—though the reflection, perhaps, smacks more of consolation than of congratulation. However, our author has done a double and a positive service : not only has he worked his field with commendable industry and skill, but by this he has also brought more clearly into notice other rich unworked regions lying contiguous.

Prefacing this study is a useful bibliographical record of recent works relating to Old English syntax, which brings down to date Chase's *Biographical Guide* of 1896 and Wülfing's lists of 1897 and 1901. The body of the work will be analyzed and criticised chapter by chapter in the paragraphs below.

Chapter I, Genitive with Verbs, consists of two parts. First comes 'classification,' listing under ten categories all verbs governing the genitive. No examples are found here, since under the second division, 'citation,' these same verbs are all rearranged, alphabetically this time, with full exemplification from the text,

and with adequate cross-reference in each case to the proper category in the first portion. This method gives the book a practical perspicuity, making it very useable for accurate and rapid reference. The verb-lists stand out all the bolder to the eye and to the mind, because their clear outline is not dulled by ragged blocks of 'citation'; and these very citations are the more available for illustration because arranged alphabetically with reference to the verb in each.

The verb-categories, just mentioned, governing the genitive, are as follows: 1, Verbs of Giving and Taking (15); 2, Verbs of Use and Experience (19); 3, Verbs of Motion and Mental Activity (51); 4, Verbs of Oral Expression (16); 5, Verbs of Rule and Control (2); 6, Verbs of Believing and Disbelieving (6); 7, Verbs of Emotion (12); 8, Verbs with Instrumental Genitive (14); 9, Verbs of Separation (47); 10, Verbs of Helping (4); 11, Verbs with Genitive of Value, Crime, etc., (6).

In the first four classes named, the genitive often finds the accusative a vigorous rival. To decide their quarrel, appeal was made to Grimm's formula—'Der Akkusativ drückt reine, sichere Wirkungen aus, der Genitiv gehemmte, modifizierte.' Also with simple verbs of these four classes, the genitive is usual and the accusative, rare; but after the *ge-* compound of the same verbs, the accusative is the rule and the genitive, the exception. Thus the following verbs regularly take the last-named case, while their compounds with *ge-* take the accusative: *bycgan*, *ceapian*, *hleotan*, *streonan*; *costian*, *cunnian*; *bidan*, *earnian*, *gyman*, *hentan*, *munan*, *mynegian*, *neosian*, *tilian*, *wyrcan*.

In classes 5–8, the genitive represents an older locative or instrumental; while in class 9, after verbs of separation, it is the survival of an original ablative. In class 10, the verbs of helping, (*a-*) *helpian*, *geocian*, *miltsian*, show an occasional genitive of personal object, instead of the more usual dative; and in class 11, the genitive of value, crime, etc., corresponding to a similar usage in Latin and Greek, is a shrinking intruder into the domain of Old English.

This outline though brief is enough to show that the investigation of the Genitive with Verbs is complete in citation and very perspicuous in presentation. Few errors or inconsistencies have been discovered in this chapter. In class 2, page 14, *bitan* and *nytan*

should have the sign (?) suffixed, since reference to their respective citation-groups, pages 27 and 50, shows that the question of a genitive object with each of these verbs is an open one. *Bædan*, cited on page 23, seems to have been omitted from the category-list of class 8, page 18 ; similarly, *gewreccan*, cited on page 43, should, it seems, be found in class 11, page 20. Passing mention might be made of the inconsistency of translating in this class alone the verb-lists.

Coming next to Chapter II, Genitive with Adjectives, we find the same commendable clarity of arrangement and completeness of citation. The poetry, from the greater flexibility of its language, is more lenient than the prose toward this usage of the genitive. Ninety-four adjectives with this case are listed by Shipley in six classes, as follows : 1, Adjectives of Plenty and Want (25); 2, Adjectives denoting a Mental or Physical Quality (46); 3, Adjectives of Readiness and Desire (12); 4, Adjectives of Remembering and Forgetting (3); 5, Adjectives denoting Merit and Guilt (4); 6, Adjectives of Extent (4).

Chapter III, Genitive with Nouns, is confessedly incomplete—and the thorough work done in the two just reviewed tends in no wise to reconcile us to the sudden lapse here. Fifty-three pages are given to the genitive with verbs and seventeen to the genitive with adjectives, but the adnominal genitive is allowed a bare five—a contrast that is its own commentary.

However, in spite of this incompleteness and in spite of a total absence of analytic form, what this chapter does set forth is full of suggestion and interest ; for example : the ablative genitive of the poetry, as in *Gen. 1427 him lifes weard frea ælmihtig frecenra siðra reste ageaf*, rest from his perilous journeys ; the predicate genitive of quality, *Ex. 305 wæs seo eorla gedriht anes modes*, the host of men was of one mind ; or of possession, *Ps. 99. 2 he us geworhte and we his syndon*. The prose has an interesting example of this usage, which I may add here, viz., *Dial. 165. 25 Næron ðis na ure weorc, ac hit wæron ðara haligra apostola*.

The earliest stage of the transition to the widespread prepositional construction for the genitive in Modern English is referred by Shipley to such constructions as the following one : *And. 1425 ðu gehete . . . ðæt ne loc of heafde to forlure wurde*, thou didst promise that not a hair of our head should perish. This transition, from

an adverbial of (from) + dative to an adjective phrase of origin or possession, is very easy, our author says ; but he warns us to make allowance, especially in the prose, for a literal translation of the Latin *ex*, *de* + ablative.

A final item of interest in this chapter is the genitive in apposition with an original genitive force in the possessive adjective pronominal forms. Three instances of this usage are cited : *Gen. 985 and his blod ageat, Cain Abeles* ; the remaining two are *Ps. 118. 3* and *Itag. 167*.

Likewise Chapter IV, Genitive with Pronouns, is lacking in adequate citation no less than in definite statement of its subject. A rather dilatory discussion of the genitive after *eall* and *eall ðæt*, after the relative and demonstrative, and after pronominal adverbs constitutes the substance of the chapter. An interesting anomaly noted here is the omission of the pronominal word upon which the partitive genitive depends, as in *El. 325, georne sohton ða wiosotan wordgeryna, ðæt hio ðare cwene oncwæðan meakton swa tiles swa trages, swa hio him to sohte*, eagerly they sought those wisest in wordsecrets, that they might answer the queen whatever of good or evil she asked of them. The remaining instances of this usage are *Sal. 286* and *Ps. 88. 7*.

In Chapter V, Genitive with Numerals, is a welcome return to the exhaustive, systematic, and orderly standards of work prevailing in the first two chapters. Interesting under 'compound numbers' is the word-order found in numerals composed of three significant figures :—either *units and tens (genitive) + hundreds*, or *units and hundreds (genitive) + tens*. The detached part always bears the alliteration and is usually connected in thought with what precedes by the addition of *eac* or *to*. After this and other similar introductory matter, the chapter closes with full citation of all numerical expressions found in the poetry. There are over a hundred of them, ranging from 1 to 100,000 ; and they form a valuable reference group.

The remaining chapters of the book are also well done. In VI, Genitive with Comparative and Superlative, Shipley lays stress upon the groundlessness of the assertion that the object of comparison after a comparative may be expressed by genitive, instead of by the dative-instrumental, when *ðonne* is omitted. The error of those who have argued for an Old English genitive of com-

parison, he says, arises from a mistaken interpretation of the case ending in such examples as *El.* 1110, *sunnan*, *beorhtran*, etc. Wülfing's single instance of this construction (Syntax Alfreds § 10<sup>a</sup>) Shipley will not allow :—*Bo.* 176. 17 *gif ðu ðe wilt don manegra beteran and weorðran*, ðonne scealt ðu ðe lætan *anes wyrsan* (= et qui præire ceteras honore cupis, poscendi humilitate vilesces). In this, our author rightly contends, *beteran*, *weorðran*, and *wyrsan* are used substantively ; and he translates :—‘If thou wilt make thyself the superior of many and more honorable, then must thou let thyself be the inferior of none.’

In Chapter VII, Genitive as Adverb, it is shown that the ideas usually expressed by this usage are those of time, manner, or condition ; genitive adverbs of place are very rare in the poetry. Also, a noun in the genitive used adverbially is seldom accompanied by an adjective modifier.

Chapter VIII, Genitive with Prepositions, shows that only *wið* and *to* govern this case in the poetry. *Wið* + genitive follows (a) verbs of motion, (b) verbs of striving, and (c) verbs meaning ‘protect,’ to express the object guarded against. *To* + genitive has a limited occurrence as follows: (a) after verbs of motion to express the object of motion—a usage peculiar to the poetry ; (b) forming a single phrase of degree, *to ðæs*. Besides the above uses, *innan* takes the genitive in one instance: *Ps.* 142. 4 *is me ænge gast innan hreðres* (et anxius est in me spiritus meus). Also, *utan* once: *Ps.* 64, 8 *ðeoda him ondraedað ðinne egesan, ðe eard nymað utan landes* (qui habitant fines terræ). However, I should think it possible here to regard *innan* and *utan* as adverbs, allowing the genitives in each sentence to depend upon *gast* and *eard* respectively.

Chapter IX is a very short one, citing five examples of the genitive used with *wa* and *wel* to denote the source of weal or woe. These citations are: with *wa*, *El.* 628, *Hym.* 2. 6, *Met.* 1. 25, *Ps.* 119. 5 ; with *wa*, *Hym.* 2. 11. Chapter X is a grouping for reference of all doubtful passages discussed ; and a useful index of all those concerning which any comment is made closes the book.

The text, as a rule, is free from typographical errors ; those noticed are the following: 22, *Cri.* 1475 *bitram* for *bitran*, *Ps.* 118. 95 *asecian* for *asecean* (following Grein's misprint); 25, *Gn.* C. 60 *biðad* for *bidað*; 26, *And.* 1032 *bad* for *bæd*, *Cri.* 1508

*wonhæle* for *wonhale*; 28, *Cri.* 392 *mostan* for *motan*, *Cri.* 1664 *cyniges* for *cyninges*; 30, *Ps.* 94. 9 *ðurh facne* (following Grein's error) for *ðurh facen*; 38, *Gen.* 1029 *fæde* for *fæhde*, *jtag.* 11 *ðas* for *ðas*; 50, (*p.* 14) omitted after *nytan* l. 7; 51, *Met.* 26. 90 *onbihtan* for *onbitan*; 59, *Met.* 28. 44 *he* for *hie*; 73, *Jul.* 31 *geholde* for *geheolde*; 98. 16 *groups* for *group*.

Shipley's work is worthy of emulation in at least these three things: choice of subject, extent of research, and typographical form.

First, his choice of subject fills a definite gap in the investigation of Old English syntax—and a similar treatment of one of the remaining cases, the dative for instance, would seem a tempting dissertation subject in one of our advanced seminars; for he chooses most wisely whose subject fills in the larger outlines his predecessors have already drawn. Only in this way can the line of advance into Old English syntax be kept unbroken. The tyro, by whom much of this work is being done, too often breaks into, preëmpts, and half-cultivates new territory, instead of keeping steadily abreast of his fellows. To be original either in subject-matter or method is not to be erratic.

Secondly, the scope of the text examined in this work gives a certain firmness and repose to its deductions: it is a commonplace that the stability of results reached is in direct ratio to extent of research. It would seem out of place to stress nowadays this principle of Old English syntactical study, had not even this last year brought forth investigations of the 'one-text' type, whose deductions, resting on so narrow a basis, are worse than useless, because misleading.

Thirdly, for its clear typographic effect Shipley's study is perhaps the very best to appear—due in some degree, no doubt, to the author's journalistic training. This quality of philologic work, at least, in Old English, is too much neglected. The mind must be reached through the eye—we lack as yet the popular lecturer on Old English syntax—hence the practical economic superiority of clear, bold typography. It must be granted that the exigencies of such a study tax the compositor to the utmost. This is due chiefly to the blurring effect masses of illustrative excerpts give to the categories. Shipley's twofold division into 'classification' and 'citation' is an admirable way out of this difficulty: the first

gives an open, untrammelled outline, the second groups the examples quoted in perfect form for ready reference ; and I am inclined to think that this method, with the necessary adaptation, would help to bring order out of that eye-wearying chaos found in too many of even our best syntactical studies.

H. G. SHEARIN.

RIPON COLLEGE.

---

*Studies in Modern German Literature*, by Otto Heller, Professor of the German Language and Literature, Washington University, St. Louis. Ginn & Co., Boston, 1905.

The book under consideration is characterized by a robust independence, a quality which is unfortunately quite uncommon in our critics of contemporary literature who are generally content to repeat well or ill founded statements. There is ample evidence of the author's immediate study of the books which he discusses, hence the criticisms are fresh and stimulating, even if one does not agree with all the conclusions which have been reached. The author's intimate knowledge of the larger field of German literature has enabled him to present his subject in true perspective, and the interesting comparisons with English and American books will be particularly welcome to the reader who accepts this book as a guide in taking up the study of 'Sudermann, Hauptmann, and the Women Writers of the Nineteenth Century.'

The present tendency to underrate Sudermann and exalt Hauptmann has caused a reaction on the part of the author, with the result that Sudermann is placed in a much truer light than commonly. Without becoming blind to the poet's defects, the author gives a lucid and sympathetic analysis of his characters and plots. While not all will agree with the analysis of single plays, as for instance 'Johannesfeuer' and 'Sturmgesele Sokrates,' the chapter on Sudermann is the most significant contribution to our knowledge of the poet in recent years.

The author's cautious views on naturalism have probably prevented him from approaching Hauptmann in the same sympathetic spirit. Several statements in the book also lead the reviewer to the opinion that the author has been influenced unduly by the productions of the plays. Since Hauptmann frequently merely